REMARKS

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of claims 8, 10 and 11.

Claims 1, 6-7 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madour et al. (US #6,912,214) in view of Nesargi et al. (US #2005/0036463). On page 3 of the Office Action, FIG. 2 of Madour is cited as disclosing Applicant's limitation of "a base station receiving a first message from a packet control function, the message containing stored service configuration information comprising at least one of a service option and a service reference identifier." In particular, the office action cites step 27 where the PCF sends an A11 registration request with lifetime=0 to the PDSN and equates step 27 to "receiving stored service configuration information from a PCF." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

An A11 registration request with lifetime=0 is not the same as "stored service configuration information comprising at least one of a service option and a service reference identifier" as recited in claim 1. As stated in Madour, col. 5, lines 62-66, the A11 registration request with lifetime=0 is used to release the A10 connection between the PCF and PDSN and release the active PPP session. Even if an A11 registration request with lifetime=0 could be equated to stored service configuration information (which as just explained it does not) Madour discloses, at most, the PCF sending stored service configuration information to the PDSN. Applicant's claim 1 recites a base station receiving stored service configuration information from the PCF. Madour does not disclose this. The only signaling from the PCF to the base station disclosed in Madour is the A9-Update-A8 Ack in step 28 of FIG. 2. This message is an acknowledgement of the A9-Update-A8 message (step 26) wherein the base station informs the PDF that the mobile station is powering down. (See col. 5, lines 54 to 59 and col. 6, lines 1-2.)

Applicant submits that neither Madour, nor Nesargi, alone or in combination discloses Applicant's claim 1 limitation of "a base station receiving a message from a packet control function, the message containing stored service

5

configuration information comprising at least one of a service option and a service reference identifier."

On page 3 of the office action, Madour and Nesargi are cited as teaching the limitations of claim 12. However, there are no portions of Madour or Nesargi that teach "a base station assigning an identifier corresponding to a current service configuration for a mobile station for a dormant packet data session" and "sending the identifier and the corresponding service configuration to a packet control function, the service configuration comprising at least one of a service reference identifier and a service option." Applicants note that the office Action does not reference any portions of Madour or Nesargi that teach the limitations of claim 12.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 8 and 12 are in condition for allowance. Applicants further submit that claims 3, 5, 6-7, and 10-11 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 8 respectively. Applicants request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,
Sayeedi, Shahab et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

By: /Lalita W. Pace/

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Lalita W. Pace
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 39,427

Customer Number: **22917**

Telephone: 847-538-5855
Fax: 847-576-3750